

**Customer No. 27061**  
Confirmation No. 7317

Patent  
Attorney Docket No. GEMS8081.070

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of : Mullen et al.  
Serial No. : 09/681,475  
Filed : April 13, 2001  
For : Method and System for Graphically Displaying Consolidated  
Condition Data for Equipment in a Host Facility  
Group Art No. : 3714  
Examiner : Ronald Laneau

---

**CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a) and 1.10**

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being:

**Mailing**

- ☐ deposited with the US Postal Service in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**37 CFR 1.8(a)**

**37 CFR 1.10**

- ☐ with sufficient postage as first class mail      ☐ As "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Mailing Label No.

**Transmission**

- ☐ transmitted by facsimile to Fax No.: 571-273-8300 addressed to Examiner Ronald Laneau at the Patent and Trademark Office.  
☒ transmitted by EFS-WEB addressed to Examiner Ronald Laneau at the Patent and Trademark Office.

Date: March 28, 2008

/Robyn L. Templin/  
Signature

---

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REPLY BRIEF RESPONSIVE TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER**  
**MAILED JANUARY 29, 2008**

Dear Sir:

This Reply Brief is being filed in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed January 29, 2008.

**REPLY BRIEF**

In the Examiner's Answer mailed January 29, 2008, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1, 4, 7-9, 11-14, 16-19, and 21-34.

In preparing the Examiner's Answer, it appears that the Examiner has merely copied assertions previously set forth in the Final Office Action of March 7, 2007. In fact, in section **(10) Response to Argument** of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner stated that "Applicant's arguments filed on 12/19/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive." *Examiner's Answer*, January 29, 2008, p. 6. Appellant is aware of the Examiner's previous rejection of those arguments set forth in the Response dated December 19, 2006; however, Appellant believes that the arguments set forth in the Appeal Brief are what should properly be considered in determining patentability of the present claims.

Appellant stands by its Appeal Brief as filed and believes that no further remarks are necessary. Appellant will not be filing comments to the Examiner's remarks set forth in the Examiner's Answer filed on January 29, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent L. Baker/

Kent L. Baker  
Registration No. 52,584  
Phone 262-268-8100  
klb@zpspatents.com

Dated: March 28, 2008  
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.070

**P.O. ADDRESS:**

Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC  
136 South Wisconsin Street  
Port Washington, WI 53074  
262-268-8100

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin R. Rosin/

Kevin R. Rosin  
Registration No. 55,584  
Phone 262-268-8100 ext. 15  
krr@zpspatents.com